UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/366,135	08/02/1999	LLOYD A. ADAMS	P/2167-105	2699

7590 11/25/2003	EXAMINER
Steven I. Weisburd, Esq.	CHENCINSKI, SIEGFRIED E
Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky LLP	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

1177 Avenue Of the Americas- 41 floor
New York, NY 10036-2714

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 17 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

a) ☒ The period for reply expires _4_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.

2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:

   (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);

   (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
     NOTE: _____.

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

5. ☒ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: *See Continuation Sheet.*

6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.

7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)☐ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on _____ is a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.

10. ☐ Other: _____

HYUNG SOUGH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

11/20/03

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments are not persuasive as follows.

1. Re. the Argument that Campbell does not teach the retention of "separate unique processing systems and, unlike Campbell, uses a processor to analyze and transmit the transaction data to one of several financial accounting systems". Applicant is referred to the Examiner's most recent Response to Arguments. Further, in fact, Campbell likewise uses a processor to analyze and transmit data to one of several financial accounting systems (Col. 1, lines 62-63; Col. 2, lines 3-7). Applicant is also referred to Campbell's teaching of a host computer "which serves as a back-up and archive for the financial data utilized by the mini-computers in processing and keeping account of the financial data used by those offices" (Col. 3, lines 40-43). Also, Campbell does not teach the abolition and replacement of the various financial and accounting systems. It is obvious that Campbell teaches the data processing of a plurality of financial transaction accounting systems located in a plurality of states having differing laws affecting these systems (Col. 2, lines 39-44). This fits the broadest reasonable definition of Applicant's claimed limitations in the preamble of independent Claim 69 ("a plurality of financial transaction accounting systems"), and likewise in the limitations of independent claims 88, 93, 101, 121, 125, 133 and 154. Campbell clearly does not teach the abolition of these systems but rather their data processing integration through a central processor or back-up processor.

2. Applicant is referred to the Reply to Arguments of the Examiner's last Action re. Applicant's arguments that a) there is no teaching or motivation to combine the teachings of Campbell with that of Berger, and b) that GAAP does not cure any of the deficiencies with respect to the Campbell and Berger references.

3. Re.the Argument differentiating between the parsing of single versus multiple data sets, it makes not difference to a parsing processor. An analogy is to an e-mail sent to one recipient versus an e-mail sent to a plurality of recipients. The processor will respectively send the e-mail to the one and to the plurality of addresses in the other. It is obvious that the parsing processor of Berger will process a group of transaction data sets in the same way in which it will process single data sets.

2